arXiv:1410.8334v1 [math.AG] 30 Oct 2014

The profinite polynomial automorphism group

Stefan Maubach
Jacobs University Bremen
Bremen, Germany
s.maubach@jacobs-university.de

Abdul Rauf*
Jacobs University Bremen
Bremen, Germany
a.rauf@jacobs-university.de

October 31, 2014

Abstract

We introduce an extension of the (tame) polynomial automorphism group over finite fields: the profinite (tame) polynomial automorphism group, which is obtained by putting a natural topology on the automorphism group. We show that most known candidate non-tame automorphisms are inside the profinite tame polynomial automorphism group, giving another result showing that tame maps are potentially "dense" inside the set of automorphisms. We study the profinite tame automorphism group and show that it is not far from the set of bijections obtained by endomorphisms.

AMS classification: 14R20, 20B25, 37P05, 11T06, 12E20

Contents

1 Preliminaries **2**
1.1 Notations and definitions 2
1.2 Introduction 2
1.3 Organisation of this paper 3

2 Profinite endomorphisms **4**

3 Automorphisms fixing a variable **5**

4 The profinite permutations induced by endomorphisms **8**

5 The profinite tame automorphism group acting on orbits of a fixed size **10**

*Supported by DAAD grant (funding program ID 57076385).

6 The case when m is prime integer **17**

7 A bound on the index of $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ in $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ **20**
Keywords: polynomial automorphism, polynomial map, permutation group.

1 Preliminaries

1.1 Notations and definitions

The notation $(X_1, \ldots, \hat{X}_i, \ldots, X_n)$ means that we skip the ith entry. q will be a prime power (of p, a prime).

1.2 Introduction

If k is a field, then in this article, we are considering polynomial maps $F = (F_1, \ldots, F_n)$ where $F_i \in k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$. The collection of polynomial maps over k is denoted by $\mathrm{MA}_n(k)$. They form a monoid under composition $\circ$ (and abelian group under $+$), and each polynomial map indeed induces a map $k^n \longrightarrow k^n$. Thus, in general, we have a map

$$\mathrm{MA}_n(k) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Maps}(k^n, k^n)$$

This map is injective unless k is a finite field - and it's exactly the latter case we'll be discussing in this article. Thus, we define

$$\pi_q : \mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Maps}(\mathbb{F}_q^n, \mathbb{F}_q^n)$$

The monoid $\mathrm{MA}_n(k)$ has a unit element $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$. The subset of invertible elements forms a group, and is denoted as $\mathrm{GA}_n(k)$. (As a remark, a famous conjecture, the Jacobian Conjecture, states that if $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$, then $F \in \mathrm{MA}_n(k)$ plus $\det \mathrm{Jac}(F) \in k^*$ implies that $F \in \mathrm{GA}_n(k)$.) There are a few obviously invertible polynomial maps:
(1) Invertible affine maps (i.e $F = TL$ where T is a translation and L is invertible linear). The set of these maps forms a group, denoted by $\mathrm{Aff}_n(k)$.
(2) Triangular (or Jonquière) maps: $F = (a_1X_1 + f_1, \ldots, a_nX_n + f_n)$ where $a_i \in k^*$ and $f_i \in k[X_{i+1}, \ldots, X_n]$. The set of these maps also forms a group, denoted by $\mathrm{BA}_n(k)$. The set of all triangular maps such that $a_i = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ is called the set of strictly triangular polynomial maps, and is a subgroup of $\mathrm{BA}_n(k)$ and is denoted by $\mathrm{BAs}_n(k)$.
(See [2] or any other standard source for proofs on the invertibility of these maps.)

It is now natural to define the set of tame automorphisms, $\mathrm{TA}_n(k) =< \mathrm{BA}_n(k), \mathrm{Aff}_n(k) >$. In dimension 2 it is proven that $\mathrm{TA}_2(k) = \mathrm{GA}_2(k)$ (the Jung-van der Kulk-theorem). A highly sought-after question (posed by Nagata in 1974) was if $\mathrm{TA}_n(k) = \mathrm{GA}_n(k)$ for some k and $n \geq 3$. It took about 30 years till Umirbaev and Shestakov proved

that if $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$ then $\mathrm{TA}_3(k) \neq \mathrm{GA}_3(k)$ [8, 9]. The problem is still open in higher dimensions and in characteristic p - the latter being the topic of this article. In fact, one of the motivations for this article is in trying to see if $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ can be different from $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$, which would induce that the groups are not equal and show the existence of wild maps over $\mathbb{F}_q$.

One of the motivating questions for studying this group is the following: what if $\pi_q(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ is unequal to $\pi_q(\mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$? Then $\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ must be unequal to $\mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, and we have shown that there exist non-tame maps (in a potential trivial way). In particular, in [4] the following theorem is proven:

Theorem 1.1. *If $n \geq 2$, then $\pi_q(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) = \mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ if q is odd or $q = 2$. If $q = 2^m$ where $m \geq 2$ then $\pi_q(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) = \mathrm{Alt}(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$.*

The following natural conjecture was posed in the same paper:

Question 1.2. Is there an automorphism $F \in \mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_{2^m})$ where $m \geq 2$ such that $\pi_{2^m}(F)$ is odd?

Such an example would then automatically have to be a non-tame automorphism. The above question, even though getting reasonable attention, is unsettled for more than ten years now. But, then the next step is:

Question 1.3. Is there an automorphism $F \in \mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $\pi_{q^m}(F) \notin \pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$?

We address this question for a large class of candidate wild maps in section 3.

1.3 Organisation of this paper

This paper is organised as follows:
In section 1 (this section) we give a motivation for and overview of the results in the paper.
In section 2 we define the profinite endomorphism monoid $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{MA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, and the underlying groups $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{GA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$.
In section 3 we show that a large class of potentially non-tame maps in $\mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ are inside $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ (i.e. are "profinitely tame")
In section 4 we analyze the group of invertible elements in $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{MA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, as this is the "world" in which $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{GA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ live in.
In sections 5,6,7, we study the "distance" between $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{GA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Here, section 5 (the main bulk) is an unavoidably technical and tricky proof of a bound between $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ and $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) \cap \mathrm{Perm}((F_{q^m})^n)$. This bound is made explicit in section 7.
In section 6 we give some examples where we compute the actual size of $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ for some specific q, m.

2 Profinite endomorphisms

It is not that hard to see that $\pi_q(\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) = \mathrm{Maps}(\mathbb{F}_q^n, \mathbb{F}_q^n)$, i.e. π_q is surjective. It becomes interesting if one wants to study $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$, as this will not be equal to $\mathrm{Maps}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n, \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n)$. In order to understand this, let us define the group action

$$\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m} : \mathbb{F}_q) \times (\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^n \longrightarrow (\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^n$$

by

$$\phi \cdot (a_1, \ldots, a_n) = (\phi(a_1), \ldots, \phi(a_n)).$$

If $\alpha \in (\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^n$, we will denote by $[\alpha]$ the orbit $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m} : \mathbb{F}_q)\alpha$. It is clear that if $F \in \mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, then $\phi\pi_{q^m}(F) = \pi_{q^m}\phi(F)$. With a little effort one can show that this is the only constraint:

Proposition 2.1.

$$\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) = \{\sigma \in \mathrm{Maps}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n, \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n) \mid \sigma\phi = \phi\sigma \ \forall \ \phi \in \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m} : \mathbb{F}_q)\}.$$

The above proposition can be easily proved by the following lemma:

Lemma 2.2.
(1) For every $\alpha \in (\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^e$ there exists $f_{\alpha,1} \in \mathbb{F}_q[Y_1, \ldots, Y_e]$ such that $f_{\alpha,1}(\beta) = 0$ if $[\beta] \neq [\alpha]$ and $f_{\alpha,1}(\beta) = 1$ if $[\beta] = [\alpha]$.
(2) In case $\mathbb{F}_q(\alpha) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, then for every $b \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ there exists $f_{\alpha,b} \in \mathbb{F}_q[Y_1, \ldots, Y_e]$ such that $f_{\alpha,b}(\beta) = 0$ if $[\beta] \neq [\alpha]$ and $f_{\alpha,b}(\beta) = b$ if $\beta = \alpha$.

Proof. It is trivial that there exists a polynomial $g_{\alpha,1} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[Y_1, \ldots, Y_e]$ such that $g_{\alpha,1}(\beta) = 0$ unless $\beta = \alpha$, when it is 1. Defining

$$f_{\alpha,1} = \prod_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m} : \mathbb{F}_q)} \sigma(g_{\alpha,1})$$

we see that $f_{\alpha,1} \in \mathbb{F}_q[Y_1, \ldots, Y_e]$ as $\sigma(f_{\alpha,1}(\beta)) = f_{\alpha,1}(\sigma(\beta))$ for every $\sigma \in \Delta$, $\beta \in (\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^e$. Now $f_{\alpha,1}(\beta) = 0$ if $[\beta] \neq [\alpha]$ and $f_{\alpha,1}(\alpha) = 1$, solving (1). Now assuming $\mathbb{F}_q[\alpha] = \mathbb{F}_q(\alpha) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, there exists some $h \in \mathbb{F}_q[Y_1, \ldots, Y_e]$ such that $h(\alpha) = b$. Now $f_{\alpha,b} := hf_{\alpha,1}$ has the desired property yielding (2). □

Proof. (of proposition 2.1) Let us write A for the right hand side of the equality; we only need to show that $A \subseteq \pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$. Note that A as well as $\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ are $\mathbb{F}_q$-vector spaces and π_{q^m} is $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear. If $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ and $\sigma \in A$, and ϕ is a generator of the cyclic group $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m} : \mathbb{F}_q)$, then the order of $\sigma(\alpha)$ under ϕ must divide the order of α under ϕ (as $\phi\sigma(\alpha) = \sigma(\phi(\alpha))$). Thus $[\mathbb{F}_q(\sigma(\alpha)) : \mathbb{F}_q]$ divides $[\mathbb{F}_q(\alpha) : \mathbb{F}_q]$ meaning that $\sigma(\alpha) \in \mathbb{F}_q(\alpha)^n$. If $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_q(\alpha)^n$ then define $\sigma_{\alpha,\beta} \in A$ as the map which is zero outside of $[\alpha]$, and satisfies $\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(\alpha) = \beta$. (This fixes an element of A.) The maps $\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}$ form a generating set of A. Now picking f_{α,β_i} from lemma 2.2 and forming $F = (f_{\alpha,\beta_1}, \ldots, f_{\alpha,\beta_n})$ we have $\pi_{q^m}(F) = \sigma_{\alpha,\beta}$ and we are done. □

If $d|m$, then there exists a natural restriction map $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) \longrightarrow \pi_{q^d}(\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$. In a diagram, we get



where above we have put the inverse limit $\varprojlim_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ of this partially ordered diagram of groups.

Definition 2.3. The inverse limit of the above partially ordered diagram of groups is called the profinite polynomial endomorphism monoid over $\mathbb{F}_q$, and denoted as $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{MA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Similarly, we define $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{GA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ etc.

Note that $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{MA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ can be seen as a subset of $\mathrm{Maps}(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n, \bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n)$, and in fact proposition 2.1 shows that $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{MA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) = \{\sigma \in \mathrm{Maps}(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n, \bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n) \mid \sigma\phi = \phi\sigma, \forall \phi \in \mathrm{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q : \mathbb{F}_q)\}$. We can also embed $\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ into $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{MA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ by the injective map $\bar{\pi} : \mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Maps}(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n, \bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n)$. Another[1] interpretation is that we put a topology on the set $\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ where a basis of open sets is $\{\ker(\pi_{q^m}); m \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{MA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is the completion w.r.t. this topology. (There is similarity with the construction of the p-adic integers $\mathbb{Z}_p$ out of the maps $\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$, or perhaps better, the construction of the profinite completion of $\mathbb{Z}$, $\hat{\mathbb{Z}} = \prod_p \mathbb{Z}_p$ out of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.)

3 Automorphisms fixing a variable

Notations: If $F \in \mathrm{GA}_n(k[Z])$ and $c \in k$, write $F_c \in \mathrm{GA}_n(k)$ for the restriction of F to $Z = c$. In case we already have a subscript $F = G_\sigma$, then $G_{\sigma,c} = F_c$.

[1] Well, it's actually the definition.

If $F \in \mathrm{GA}_n(k)$, then by $(F, Z) \in \mathrm{GA}_{n+1}(k)$ (or any other appropriate variable in stead of Z) we denote the canonical map obtained by F by adding one dimension. If $F \in \mathrm{GA}_n(k[Z])$ then we identify F on $k[Z]^n$ with (F, Z) on k^{n+1} and denote both by F. (In fact, we think of $\mathrm{GA}_n(k[Z])$ as a subset of $\mathrm{GA}_{n+1}(k)$.)

The main result of this section is the following proposition:

Theorem 3.1. *If $F \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q(Z)) \cap \mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z])$, and $F_c \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[c])$ for all $c \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, then $F \in \overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z])$.*

This immediately yields the following important corollary:

Corollary 3.2.

$$\mathrm{GA}_2(\mathbb{F}_q[Z]) \subseteq \overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_2(\mathbb{F}_q[Z]) \subseteq \overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_3(\mathbb{F}_q).$$

In particular, it shows that the famous (notorious?) Nagata automorphism $N = (X - 2Y\Delta - Z\Delta^2, Y + Z\Delta, Z)$ where $\Delta = XZ + Y^2$ is an element of $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_3(\mathbb{F}_q)$. This shows that Nagata's automorphism is the "limit" of tame maps, which calls up resemblance to [1], where a wild automorphism is shown to be a limit of tame maps in the "regular" topology over $\mathbb{C}$. Slightly more off, the result of Smith ([**?**]) shows that the Nagata automorphism is stably tame.

Before we state the proof of 3.1, we must derive some tools:

Definition 3.3. A map is called *strictly Jonquières* if it is Jonquières, and has affine part equal to the identity (i.e. linear part identity and zero maps to zero).

Lemma 3.4. *Let $F \in \mathrm{TA}_n(k(Z))$ be such that the affine part of F is the identity. Then F can be written as a product of strictly Jonquières maps and permutations.*

Proofs like the one below use arguments that can be called standard by those familiar with using the Jung-van der Kulk theorem. Together with the fact that a precise proof is less insightful and involves even more bookkeeping, we decided to sketch the proof:

Proof. (rough sketch.) The whole proof works since one can "push" elements which are both Jonquières and affine to one side, since if E is Jonquières (or affine), and D is both, then there exists an E' which is Jonquières (or affine), and $ED = DE'$. This argument is used to standardize many a decomposition. Here, we emphasize that the final decomposition is by no means of minimal length.
(1) First, using the definition of tame maps, we decompose
$F = E_1 A_1 E_2 A_2 \cdots E_s A_s$ where each E_i is Jonquières and each A_i is affine.
(2) *We may assume that $E_i(0) = A_i(0) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$.* For any pure translation part can be pushed to the left, and then we use the fact that $F(0) = 0$. I.e. the A_i are linear.
(3) *We may assume that* $\det(A_i) = 1$ *and the E_i are strictly Jonquières.* To realize this, one must notice that there exists a diagonal linear map D_i satisfying $\det(D_i) = \det(A_i)$, and that we can do this by pushing diagonal linear maps to the

left. The result follows since the determinant of the linear part of F is 1, and hence the determinant of the Jacobian of F is 1.
(4) *We may assume that each A_i is either diagonal of determinant 1 or -1, or a permutation.* Now we use Gaussian Elimination to write each $A_i = P_{i1}E_{i1}\cdots P_{it}E_{it}D_i$ as a composition of permutations P_{ij}, strictly Jonquières (elementary linear) maps E_{ij}, and one diagonal map D_i. We may assume that each E_{ij} is in fact upper triangular, by conjugating with a permutation. Note that the determinant of each E_{ij} is 1, and of each P_{ij} is 1 or -1, so the determinant of D_i is 1 or -1.
(5) *We may assume that each A_i is a permutation.* We have to replace the diagonal linear maps $D_i \in \mathrm{GL}_n(k(Z))$ which have determinant 1 or -1. First, write the diagonal linear map $D_i = D_{i1}\cdots D_{it}\tilde{D}_i$, where the D_{ij} are diagonal linear of determinant 1 that have 1's on n-2 places, and at most two diagonal elements which are not 1, and $\tilde{D}_i$ has 1 on the diagonal except at one place, where it is 1 or -1. The following formulas explains how to write a diagonal map D_{it} as product of (linear) strictly Jonquières maps and permutations, as well as $\tilde{D}_i$:

$$P := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},\ E[a] := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} f^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix} = E[f^{-1}]\cdot P\cdot E[1-f]\cdot P\cdot E[-1]\cdot P\cdot E[1-f^{-1}]\cdot P,$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} = E[1]\cdot P\cdot E[-1]\cdot P\cdot E[1]\cdot P.$$

This finishes (the rough sketch of) the proof. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let $g(Z) \in \mathbb{F}_q[Z]$.*
Let $F \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z, g(Z)^{-1}]) \cap \mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z])$ be such that the affine part is the identity. Assume that $F_c \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[c])$ for all $c \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and all m. Then for any $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ we find two maps $G, \tilde{G} \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z])$ such that for $c \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$:
(1) $G_c = I_n$ if $g(c) \neq 0$,
(2) $G_c = F_c$ if $g(c) = 0$,
(3) $\tilde{G}_c = F_c$ if $g(c) \neq 0$.

Proof. We may assume that m is such that g factors completely into linear factors over $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ (for the result for divisors of m is implied by the result for m). Let α be a root of g. Consider F_α, which by assumption and remark 3.4 can be written as a composition of strictly Jonquières maps e_i and permutations p_i : $F_\alpha = e_1p_1e_2\ldots e_sp_s$. Write the e_i as $I_n + H_i$ where H_i is strictly upper triangular. We can even write $H_i = f_i(\alpha, \mathcal{X})$ where $f_i(Z, \mathcal{X}) \in \mathbb{F}_q[Z, \mathcal{X}]^n$ (and $\mathcal{X}$ stands for $X_1, \ldots, X_n$).

Now we define $\rho := 1 - g^{q^m-1} \in \mathbb{F}_q[Z]$ and $E_i := I_n + \rho f_i(Z, \mathcal{X})$. Note that all $E_i \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z])$. We define $G := E_1p_1E_2p_2\cdots E_sp_s$. Our claim is that this map acts as required. Since for $c \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ we have $\rho(c) = 0$ if and only if $g(c) \neq 0$, it follows that in that case $G_c = I_n$. Since $E_{i,\alpha} = e_i$ by construction, we have $G_\alpha = F_\alpha$. Now let Φ be an element of the galois group $Gal(\mathbb{F}_{q^m} : \mathbb{F}_q)$. The remaining question is

if $G_{\Phi(\alpha)} = F_{\Phi(\alpha)}$. Note that if $P(\mathcal{X}, Z) \in \mathbb{F}_q[\mathcal{X}, Z]$ then $\Phi(P(\alpha, \mathcal{X})) = P(\Phi(\alpha), \mathcal{X})$. This implies that if $F \in \mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z])$, then $F_{\Phi(\alpha)} = \Phi(F_\alpha)$. Thus $G_{\Phi(\alpha)} = \Phi(G_\alpha) = \Phi(F_\alpha) = F_{\Phi(\alpha)}$ and we are done.

In order to construct $\tilde{G}$, we again consider the decomposition $F = e_1 p_1 e_2 p_2 \cdots e_s p_s$ where the e_i. Now we modify H_i in $e_i := I_{n+1} + H_i$ in the following way: replace each fraction g^{-t} by $g^{t(q^m-2)}$, making new elements $\tilde{H}_i$ which are in $\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z])$. Write $E_i := I_n + \tilde{H}_i$, and define $G := E_1 p_1 E_2 p_2 \cdots E_s p_s$. Note that if $c \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $g(c) \neq 0$, then $g^{-t}(c) = g^{t(q^m-2)}(c)$, thus also $E_{i,c} = e_{i,c}$. In fact, the latter remark implies that $G_c = F_c$ for all $c \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ such that $g(c) \neq 0$. □

Proof. (of proposition 3.1)
(1) We may assume that the affine part of F is the identity, by, if necessary, composing with a suitable affine map.
(2) Since $F \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q(Z))$, we can use Lemma 3.4 and decompose F into strictly Jonquières maps over $\mathbb{F}_q(Z)$ and permutations. Gathering all denominators which appear in this decomposition, we can assume that $F \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z, g(Z)^{-1}])$ for some $g(Z)$. We can assume m to be such that g factors into linear parts over $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$.
(3) We may assume that if $g(c) \neq 0$ then $F_c = I$: Using lemma 3.5 we can find $\tilde{G} \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z])$ such that $\tilde{G}_c = F_c$ if $g(c) \neq 0$. We can replace F by $\tilde{G}^{-1}F$.
(4) Using lemma 3.5 we find $G \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z])$ such that $F_c = G_c$ if $g(c) \neq 0$, $F_c = G_c = I$ if $g(c) = 0$. Thus, $G^{-1}F$ is the identity map on $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$.
Thus, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find a $G_m \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z])$ such that $\pi_{q^m}(G_m) = \pi_{q^m}(F)$ (as permutation on $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n+1}$), meaning that $F \in \overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q[Z]) \subset \overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. □

To finish this section, the below lemma clarifies exactly when a map in $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) \cap \mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is in $\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $F \in \overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, and suppose that there exists a bound $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $T_m \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$ such that $\pi_{q^m}(T_m) = \pi_{q^m}(F)$ and $\deg(T_m) \leq d$. Then $F \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$.*

Proof. There exists at most one $T \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ of degree $< q^m$ such that $\pi_{q^m}(T) = \pi_{q^m}(F)$. This means that the sequence $T_1, T_2, T_3, \ldots$ must stabilize. Thus $F = T_m$ if $q^m > d$. □

Note that the converse of the above lemma is trivially true.

4 The profinite permutations induced by endomorphisms

Definition 4.1. Define $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) := \overleftarrow{\mathrm{MA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) \cap \mathrm{Perm}(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n)$.

$\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is the set of permutations induced by *en*domorphisms. It is equal to the set of permutation of $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n$ which commute with $\mathrm{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q : \mathbb{F}_q)$. We do have the following inclusions:

$$\overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) \subseteq \overleftarrow{\mathrm{GA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F}_q).$$

This means that we have to briefly analyze $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ as this apparently is the "world" in which our more complicated objects $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{GA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ live.

Definition 4.2. Define $\mathcal{X}_d$ as the union of all orbits of size d of the action of $\mathrm{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q : \mathbb{F}_q)$ on $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n$.

If we have $\sigma, \rho \in \mathrm{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q : \mathbb{F}_q)$, then in this section we denote the action of σ on $x \in X$ by x^σ, and thus $(x)^{\sigma\rho} = ((x)^\sigma)^\rho$.) This is for now more convenient than the notation $\sigma(x)$, as in the below corollary we do not need to talk about the opposite group action etc.

Corollary 4.3. *(of 2.1)*
(1)

$$\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) = \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{N}} G_d$$

where G_d is the set of permutations on $\mathcal{X}_d$ which commute with $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^d} : \mathbb{F}_q)$.
(2) This means that

$$G_d \cong \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z} \wr \mathrm{Perm}(r_d)$$

where r_d is the amount of orbits of size d (i.e. $r_d = d^{-1}\#\mathcal{X}_d$).
(3)
This is equivalent to the following statement:

$$G_d \cong ((\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^{r_d} \rtimes_h \mathrm{Perm}(r_d)$$

where $h : \mathrm{Perm}(r_d) \longrightarrow Aut((\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^{r_d})$ such that $h(\sigma)(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{r_d}) = (a_{(1)^\sigma}, a_{(2)^\sigma}, \ldots, a_{(r_d)^\sigma})$.

Proof. Part (1) is obvious using 2.1.
Let $\mathcal{O}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_{r_d}$ be the disjoint orbits in $\mathcal{X}_d$. Let $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{O}_i$ be chosen from the orbits (at random). Write $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^d} : \mathbb{F}_q) =< \phi > \cong \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$. Now if a permutation P of $\mathcal{X}_d$ commutes with $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^d} : \mathbb{F}_q)$, then it permutes the orbits; say $\sigma \in \mathrm{Perm}(r_d)$ is this permutation. It sends $[\alpha_i]$ to $[\alpha_{(i)^\sigma}]$ and thus $(\alpha_i)^P = \phi^{a_i}\alpha_{(i)^\sigma}$ where $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$. Thus, as a set we have equality. We only need to check how the multiplication acts:

We can construct a map

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \varphi : G_d & \longrightarrow & (\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^{r_d} \rtimes_h (\mathrm{Perm}(r_d) \\ P & \longrightarrow & (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{r_d}; \sigma_P). \end{array}$$

Write $\varphi(P) = (a_1, \ldots, a_n; \sigma)$ and $\varphi(Q) = (b_1, \ldots, b_n; \rho)$ for some $P, Q \in G_d$. Now $(\alpha_i)PQ = (\phi^{a_i}\alpha_{(i)^\sigma})Q = \phi^{a_i}(\alpha_{(i)^\sigma})Q = \phi^{a_i}\phi^{b_{(i)^\sigma}}\alpha_{((i)^\sigma)^\rho} = \phi^{a_i + b_{(i)^\sigma}}\alpha_{(i)^{\sigma\rho}}$, thus

$$\varphi(PQ) = (a_1 + b_{(1)^\sigma}, \ldots, a_n + b_{(n)^\sigma}; \sigma\rho).$$

and since we want $\varphi(P)\cdot\varphi(Q)=\varphi(PQ)$ we get the multiplication rule for semidirect product

$$(a_1,\ldots,a_n;\sigma)\cdot(b_1,\ldots,b_n;\rho)=(a_1+b_{(1)^\sigma},\ldots,a_n+b_{(n)^\sigma};\sigma\rho)$$

Thus φ is a group homomorphism. Since $Ker(\varphi)=\{P\in G_d:\varphi(P)=(0,0,\ldots,0,id)\}=\{id_{G_d}\}$, the map is injective. Since the orders of the groups are the same, we have an isomorphism. □

5 The profinite tame automorphism group acting on orbits of a fixed size

Our goal is to understand "how far" $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ can be from $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{GA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ if $n\geq 3$. Since $\mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is quite ungraspeable if $n\geq 3$, we are in fact trying to understand "how far" $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{TA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is from $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, which squeezes in $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{GA}}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ in between of them.

In most of this section, we fix $m\in\mathbb{N}$. We have to introduce a score of notations:

- $\Delta=\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}:\mathbb{F}_q)$,
- $\mathcal{X}$ is the union of the orbits of size m in $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n$,
- Ω is the set of orbits of size m in $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^{n-1}$,
- $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ is the quotient of $\mathcal{X}$ under Δ, i.e. the set of orbits of size m,
- set $q=p^l$: p is prime integer, m, $l\geq 1$,
- we fix the dimension $n\geq 3$.

The action of $\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ on $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n$ restricts naturally to $\mathcal{X}$, and also induces an action on $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$. This means that we have a natural group homomorphism $\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)\longrightarrow\mathrm{Perm}(\bar{\mathcal{X}})$. We denote by $\mathtt{G}$ the image of this group homomorphism.

Our first goal is to prove the below theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *For $n\geq 3$, we have $\mathrm{Alt}(\bar{\mathcal{X}})\subseteq\mathtt{G}$.*

The rest of this section is devoted to proving this theorem. The generic outline of the proof is as follows: It is enough to show that $\mathtt{G}$ is primitive by a theorem of Jordan:

Theorem 5.2. *(Jordan) Let G be a primitive subgroup of S_n. Suppose G contains a 3-cycle. Then G contains the alternating subgroup A_n.*

Overview of the proof of theorem 5.1.
We will prove that the group G contains a 3-cycle (lemma 5.5) and is 2-transitive (which implies primitive). The latter is the most complicated part, requiring some delicate induction arguments: lemmas 5.7-5.9 are preparations to prove proposition 5.10 (2-transitivity for a large class of points). Along with this, lemmas 5.13-5.17 are preparations to prove proposition 5.18 (2-transitivity in general). The difficulty in this proof are obviously its length and occasional technicality, but also in the rather complicated induction (the lemmas 5.13-5.17) which makes the proof quite nontrivial.

Definition 5.3. (i) Let $a \in \Omega$. Then define

$$\tau_{a,1} := (X_1 + f_{a,1}(X_2, \ldots, X_n), X_2, \ldots, X_n)$$

(ii) Let $i \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$. Define

$$\tau_i := (X_i, X_2, \ldots, X_{i-1}, X_1, X_{i+1}, \ldots, X_n),$$

the map interchanging X_i and X_1.

Definition 5.4. In this article we define the lexicographic ordering of two vectors $u := (u_1, \ldots, u_n), v := (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$, notation $u \geq_{Lex} v$, if there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq m \leq n$ such that $u_m > v_m, (u_{m+1}, u_{m+2}, \ldots, u_n) = (v_{m+1}, v_{m+2}, \ldots, v_n)$. (i.e. the weight is at the "head" of a vector, not the tail).

Lemma 5.5. *The group G contains 3-cycles*

Proof. Consider $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(t)$. Let $a := (0, \ldots, 0, t) \in \Omega$ and let

$$s := \tau_{a,1} = (X_1 + g_{a,1}(X_2, \ldots, X_n), X_2, \ldots, X_n),$$

$$d := \tau_2\tau_{a,1}\tau_2 = (X_1, X_2 + g_{a,1}(X_1, X_3, \ldots, X_n), X_3, \ldots, X_n).$$

Consider $L_1 = \{[(a_1, 0, 0, \ldots, 0, a_n)] | a_n \in [t] \text{ and } a_1 \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}\}$ and $L_2 = \{[(0, a_2, 0, \ldots, 0, a_n)] | a_2 \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} \text{ and } a_n \in [t]\}$, where L_1, L_2 are subsets of $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ and $[t] = \{\phi(t) : \phi \in \Delta\}$. Then s permutes only the set L_1 and d permutes only the set L_2. Both s and d are cyclic of order $p = \text{char}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$ on L_1 and L_2 respectively. Let $w = s^{-1}d^{-1}sd$. Then w acts trivially on $\bar{\mathcal{X}} \setminus (L_1 \bigcup L_2)$ and nontrivially only on a subset of $L_1 \bigcup L_2$. Now if $b \notin L_2$ and $s(b) \notin L_2$, then since d works only on elements of L_2 one can check easily that $w(b) = b$. Similarly if $b \notin L_1$ and $d(b) \notin L_1$ then $w(b) = b$. The other cases include:
(1) $b \notin L_2$ and $s(b) \in L_2$ (the element$D := [(-1, 0, \ldots, 0, t)]$),
(2) $b \notin L_1$ and $d(b) \in L_1$ (the element $E := [(0, -1, 0 \ldots, 0, t)]$),
(3) $b \in L_1$ and $d(b) \in L_2$ ($F := [(0, \ldots, 0, t)]$).
Since $s(D) = F$,$s(E) = E$,$d(E) = F$,$d(D) = D$,$s(F) \notin L_2$,$d(F) \notin L_1$. Using this observation we see that $w(D) = E, w(E) = F, w(F) = D$ and w is the required 3-cycle. □

Here starts the technical proof of 2-transitivity (proposition 5.18). We slowly start by connecting more and more pairs $([r],[u])$ and $([s],[v])$ where $[r],[s],[v],[u] \in \bar{X}$. (For most lemmas, $[v]=[u]$.) We introduce the following definition:

Definition 5.6. We say that $u, v \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ are weakly conjugate (or, u is a weak conjugate of v) if $[u_i]=[v_i]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. We denote this as $u \approx v$. We also denote $u \not\approx v$ for "not $u \approx v$".

Note that $[u]=[v]$ implies $u \approx v$, but not the other way around. Similarly, $u \not\approx v$ implies $[u] \neq [v]$. In the below lemmas we will have to give special attention to cases where a pair of r, s, u is weakly conjugate, as this complicates things.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $r, u \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $[r] \neq [u]$. Assume $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(r_i)$ and $[r_j] \neq [u_j]$ for some $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Then for any $k \in \{1, 2 \ldots, n\}$ with $k \neq i, j$ there exist $P \in TA_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $P[r] = [(r_1, \ldots, r_{k-1}, v, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_n)]$ for any $v \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $P[u]=[u]$.*

Proof. Fix $a = (r_1, \ldots, \hat{r}_k, \ldots, r_n)$. Define $P := (X_1, \ldots, X_k + f_{a, v-r_k}(X_1, \ldots, \widehat{X_k}, \ldots, X_n), \ldots, X_n)$, where $f_{a,v-r_k}$ is as in lemma 2.2. (Note that since r_i generates $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, we can indeed apply this lemma as $a = (\ldots, r_i, \ldots)$.) Hence we have $P([r]) = [(r_1, \ldots, r_{k-1}, v, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_k)]$ and $P([u])=[u]$. □

We will use this lemma in the proof of following lemma several times. The below lemma is elementary but lenghty.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $s, r, u \in \mathcal{X}$ s.t. $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n)$, $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_n)$, and $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ be in different orbits with $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(r_1) = \mathbb{F}_q(s_1)$ and suppose $r \not\approx u, s \not\approx u$. Then there exist $F \in TA_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ s.t. $F([r]) = [s]$ and $F([u]) = [u]$.*

Proof. We divided our lemma into the following five cases.
Case 1. $[r_1] \neq [u_1]$ and $[s_1] \neq [u_1]$.
Case 2. $[r_1] \neq [u_1]$ and $[s_i] \neq [u_i]$ for some $2 \leq i \leq n$.
Case 3. $[s_1] \neq [u_1]$ and $[r_i] \neq [u_i]$ for some $2 \leq i \leq n$.
Case 4. $[r_i] \neq [u_i]$ and $[s_j] \neq [u_j]$ for some $i, j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$.

Case 1. $[r_1] \neq [u_1]$ and $[s_1] \neq [u_1]$.
As $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(r_1)$ and $[r_1] \neq [u_1]$ so by applying the tame map as in lemma 5.7 several times we map the orbit $[r]$ to $[r_1, s_1, s_3 \ldots, s_n]$ and $[u]$ remains unchanged.
Subcase 1.1. If $[(s_1, s_3, \ldots, s_n)] \neq [(u_2, \ldots, u_n)]$. Fix $a := (s_1, s_3, \ldots, s_n)$. Define$P_1 := (X_1 + f_{a, s_1 - r_1}(X_2, \ldots, X_n), X_2, \ldots, X_n)$ where f_{a,s_1-r_1} is as in lemma 2.2. (Note that since s_1 generates F_{q^m}, we can indeed apply this lemma as $a = (s_1, \ldots).$) Thus $P_1[(r_1, s_1, s_3, \ldots, s_n)] = [(s_1, s_1, s_3, \ldots, s_n)]$ and $P_1[u] = [u]$. Now as $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(s_1)$ and $[s_1] \neq [u_1]$ so by applying the tame map as in lemma 5.7 we map the orbit $[(s_1, s_1, s_3, \ldots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, s_2, s_3, \ldots, s_n)]$ and $[u]$ remains unchanged.
Subcase 1.2. If $[(s_1, s_3, \ldots, s_n)] = [(u_2, \ldots, u_n)]$. In this case we have $s_1 \in [u_2]$ and hence u_2 is also a generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. Using lemma 5.7 and $[r_1] \neq [u_1]$ we can send $[u]$ to $[u_1, u_2, u_1, u_4, \ldots, u_n]$ and $[(r_1, s_1, s_3, \ldots, s_n)]$ remains unchanged. Now with

r_1 generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $[r_1] \neq [u_1]$ send $[(r_1, s_1, s_3, \ldots, s_n)]$ to $[(r_1, s_1, s_1, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ and $[u_1, u_2, u_1, u_4, \ldots, u_n]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7. With s_1 generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $[s_1] \neq [u_1]$ send $[(r_1, s_1, s_1, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, s_2, s_1, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ and $[u_1, u_2, u_1, u_4, \ldots, u_n]$ remains unchanged by applying lemma 5.7 two times. With s_1 generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $[s_1] \neq [u_1]$ send $[(s_1, s_2, s_1, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ and $[u_1, u_2, u_1, u_4, \ldots, u_n]$ remains unchanged by applying lemma 5.7. With u_2 generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $[s_1] \neq [u_1]$ send $[u_1, u_2, u_1, u_4, \ldots, u_n]$ to $[u]$ and $[s]$ remains unchanged by applying lemma 5.7.

Case 2. $[r_1] \neq [u_1]$ and $[s_i] \neq [u_i]$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$.
Since $n \geq 3$ there exist $k \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$ such that $k \neq i$. Without loss of generality (simplifying notations) we assume $i = 2, k = 3$. With r_1 generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $[r_1] \neq [u_1]$, map $[r]$ to $[(r_1, s_2, s_1, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ and $[u]$ remains unchanged by applying lemma 5.7 several time. With $[s_2] \neq [u_2]$ and s_1 generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, map $[(r_1, s_2, s_1, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, s_2, s_1, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ and $[u]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7. With $[s_2] \neq [u_2]$ and s_1 generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, map
$[(s_1, s_2, s_1, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, \ldots, s_n)] = [s]$ and $[u]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7.

Case 3. $[s_1] \neq [u_1]$ and $[r_i] \neq [u_i]$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$.
By case 2 there exist a tame map $F \in TA_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $F[s] = [r]$ and $F[u] = [u]$, hence $F^{-1}[r] = [s]$ and $F^{-1}[u] = [u]$.

Case 4. $[r_i] \neq [u_i]$ and $[s_j] \neq [u_j]$ for some $i, j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$.
Subcase 4.1. $[r_i] \neq [u_i]$ and $[s_j] \neq [u_j]$ for some $i, j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$ with $i \neq j$.
Without loss of generality (simplifying notations) we assume $i = 2, j = 3$. With $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(r_1)$ and $[r_2] \neq [u_2]$, send the orbit $[r]$ to $[(r_1, r_2, s_3, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ and the orbit $[u]$ remains unchanged by applying the lemma 5.7 several times. With $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(r_1)$ and $[s_3] \neq [u_3]$, map $[(r_1, r_2, s_3, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ to $[(r_1, s_1, s_3, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ and $[u]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7. With $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(s_1)$ and $[s_3] \neq [u_3]$, map $[(r_1, s_1, s_3, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, s_1, s_3, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ and $[u]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7. With $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(s_1)$ and $[s_3] \neq [u_3]$, map $[(s_1, s_1, s_3, s_4, \ldots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, \ldots, s_n)] = [s]$ and the orbit $[u]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7.
Subcase 4.2. If $[r_i] \neq [u_i]$ and $[s_i] \neq [u_i]$ for some $i \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$.
Since $n \geq 3$ there exist $k \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$ such that $k \neq i$. Without loss of generality (simplifying notations) we assume $i = 2, k = 3$. As $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(r_1)$ and $[r_2] \neq [u_2]$, so by applying the tame map as in lemma 5.7 several times we map the orbit $[r]$ to $[(r_1, r_2, s_1, s_4, s_5, \ldots, s_n)]$ and the orbit $[u]$ remains unchanged (Note that here we send r_3 to s_1, because s_1 is generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and we need this to send r_1 to s_1.). With $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(s_1)$ and $[r_2] \neq [u_2]$ we map the orbit $[(r_1, r_2, s_1, s_4, s_5, \ldots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, r_2, s_1, s_4, s_5, \ldots, s_n)]$ and the orbit $[u]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7. With $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(s_1)$ and $[r_2] \neq [u_2]$ we map the orbit $[(s_1, r_2, s_1, s_4, s_5, \ldots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, r_2, s_3, s_4, s_5, \ldots, s_n)]$ and the orbit $[u]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7.
Subsubcase 4.2.1
If $[(s_1, \hat{r}_2, s_3, s_4, \ldots, s_n)] \neq [u_1, \hat{u}_2, u_3, u_4, \ldots, u_n]$. Fix $a = (s_1, \hat{r}_2, s_3, s_4, \ldots, s_n)$. Define a tame map $P = (X_1, X_2 + h_{a, s_2 - r_2}(X_1, \hat{X}_2, X_3, \ldots, X_n), X_3, X_4, \ldots, X_n)$ where

$h_{a,s-2-r_2}$ is as in lemma 2.2. (Note that since s_1 generates $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(s_1)$, we can indeed apply lemma 2.2 as $a = (s_1, \dots)$.) Thus $P[(s_1, r_2, s_3, s_4, \dots, s_n)] = [(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)] = [s]$ and $P[u] = [u]$.

Subsubcase 4.2.2

If $[(s_1, \hat{r}_2, s_3, s_4, \dots, s_n)] \neq [u_1, \hat{u}_2, u_3, u_4, \dots, u_n]$. In this case $u_1 \in [s_1]$, so $\mathbb{F}_q(u_1) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. Thus using $[r_2] \neq [u_2]$, send $[u]$ to $[(u_1, u_2, u_2, u_4, u_5, \dots, u_n)]$ and $[(s_1, r_2, s_3, s_4, \dots, s_n)]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7. Now using $\mathbb{F}_q(s_1) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $[r_2] \neq [u_2]$, send $[(s_1, r_2, s_3, s_4, \dots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, r_2, s_2, s_4, s_5, \dots, s_n)]$ and $[(u_1, u_2, u_2, u_4, u_5, \dots, u_n)]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7. With $\mathbb{F}_q(s_1) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $[s_2] \neq [u_2]$, send $[(s_1, r_2, s_2, s_4, s_5, \dots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, s_2, s_2, s_4, s_5, \dots, s_n)]$ and $[(u_1, u_2, u_2, u_4, u_5, \dots, u_n)]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7. With $\mathbb{F}_q(s_1) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $[s_2] \neq [u_2]$, send $[(s_1, s_2, s_2, s_4, s_5, \dots, s_n)]$ to $[(s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_5, \dots, s_n)] = [s]$ and $[(u_1, u_2, u_2, u_4, u_5, \dots, u_n)]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7. With $\mathbb{F}_q(u_1) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $[s_2] \neq [u_2]$, send $[(u_1, u_2, u_2, u_4, u_5, \dots, u_n)]$ to $[(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5, \dots, u_n)] = [u]$ and $[s]$ remains unchanged by lemma 5.7. Thus in all cases we can find a tame map $F \in TA_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $F[r] = [s]$ and $F[u] = [u]$. □

Lemma 5.9. *Let $r, u \in \mathcal{X}$ be in different orbits with $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ and $r = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$, $\mathbb{F}_q(r_1) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and $r \approx u$. Then there exist $G \in TA_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $G(r) \not\approx G(u)$.*

Proof. Since $r_i \in [u_i]\ \forall\ 1 \leq i \leq n$, in particular $r_1 \in [u_1]$. Thus u_1 is generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(u_1)$. Define the tame map $G_k = (X_1, \dots, X_k + f_k(X_1), \dots, X_n)$ for $2 \leq k \leq n$ where $f_k \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_k]$ is such that $f_k(u_1) = -u_k$ and $f_k([a_1]) = 0$ if $[a_1] \neq [u_1]$. Define $G = G_2 G_3 \dots G_n$. Thus $G(u_1, \dots, u_n) = (u_1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$, $G(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n) = (r_1, \tilde{r}_2, \tilde{r}_3, \dots, \tilde{r}_n)$. Since $[r] \neq [u]$ thus $G[r] \neq G[u]$. This shows at least one of $[\tilde{r}_i] \neq [0]$ for $i \geq 2$ (as $[r_1] = [u_1]$ given). Hence $G(r) \not\approx G(u)$. □

Proposition 5.10. *Let $s, r, u \in \mathcal{X}$ s.t. $s = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$, $r = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$, and $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ be in different orbits with $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(r_1) = \mathbb{F}_q(s_1)$. Then there exist $F \in TA_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ s.t. $F([r]) = [s]$ and $F([u]) = [u]$.*

Proof. Case $r \not\approx u$ and $s \not\approx u$: is done by lemma 5.8.
Case $r \approx u$ and $s \not\approx u$: In this case $r_i \in [u_i]\ \forall\ 1 \leq i \leq n$, in particular $r_1 \in [u_1]$. Thus u_1 is generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m} = \mathbb{F}_q(u_1)$. Define the tame map $F_k = (X_1, \dots, X_k + f_k(X_1), \dots, X_n)$ for $2 \leq k \leq n$ where $f_k \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_k]$ is such that $f_k(u_1) = -u_k$ and $f_k([a_1]) = 0$ if $[a_1] \neq [u_1]$. Define $F = F_2 F_3 \dots F_n$. Thus $F(u_1, \dots, u_n) = (u_1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$, $F(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n) = (r_1, \tilde{r}_2, \tilde{r}_3, \dots, \tilde{r}_n)$ and $F(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) = (s_1, \tilde{s}_2, \tilde{s}_3, \dots, \tilde{s}_n)$. Since $[r] \neq [u]$ and $[s] \neq [u]$, thus $F[r] \neq F[u]$ and $F[s] \neq F[u]$. This shows at least one of $[\tilde{r}_i] \neq [0]$ for $i \geq 2$ (as given $[r_1] = [u_1]$). Similarly at least one of $[\tilde{s}_i] \neq [0]$ for $i \geq 2$ or $[s_1] \neq [u_1]$. Thus we have reduced this case to the case $r \not\approx u$ and $s \not\approx u$.
Case $r \not\approx u$ and $s \approx u$: Similar to the previous case.
Case both $r \approx u$ and $s \approx u$: Using lemma 5.9 we find a map G such that $G(r) \not\approx G(u)$. By the previous case applied to the points $G(r), G(s), G(u)$ we find an H such

that $H([G(r)]) = [G(s)]$ and $H[G(u)] = [G(u)]$. Now taking $F = G^{-1}HG$ we see that $F[r] = G^{-1}H[G(r)] = G^{-1}[G(s)] = [s]$, $F[u] = G^{-1}H[G(u)] = G^{-1}[G(u)] = [u]$. □

The above proposition proves the 2-transitivity of our group G under the assumption that both r_1 and s_1 are generators of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. The remaining part of this section is to prove the 2-transitivity of our group G without any assumption on generators. We will do this using induction steps to the *type*:

Definition 5.11. Let $s \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$. We define the type of s to be the sequence $\overrightarrow{m_s} = (m_1, \ldots, m_n)$ where $[\mathbb{F}_q(s_i) : \mathbb{F}_q] = m_i$ and $lcm(m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_n) = m$.

Definition 5.12. The type of s is said to be ordered type if the sequence $\overrightarrow{m_s} = (m_1, \ldots, m_n)$ is decreasing i.e., $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_n$.

Our induction step will involve assuming that we have proven 2-transitivity for all ordered types of a higher lexicographic order. The case that $m_1 = m$ will then be solved by proposition 5.10.

The following lemma 5.13 will be helpful to prove the induction step, by making sure that some vector can be assumed to be in a different orbit than another vector without effecting the type of a vector.

Lemma 5.13. *Let $s, u \in \mathcal{X}$ s.t. $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n)$, and $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ be in different orbits and suppose that s has ordered type $\overrightarrow{m_s} = (m_1, \ldots, m_n)$. If $[(s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_i}, \ldots, s_n)] = [(u_1, \ldots, \hat{u_i}, \ldots, u_n)]$, then for all $j \neq i$ with $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ there exist a polynomial map $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[(X_1, \ldots, \hat{X_j}, \ldots, X_n)]$ such that $[(s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_i}, \ldots, s_j + f(s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_j}, \ldots, s_n), \ldots, s_n)] \neq [(u_1, \ldots, \hat{u_i}, \ldots, u_j, \ldots, u_n)]$ and $[\mathbb{F}_q(s_j + f(s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_j}, \ldots, s_n)) : \mathbb{F}_q] = m_j$.*

Proof. Since $[(s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_i}, \ldots, s_n)] = [(u_1, \ldots, \hat{u_i}, \ldots, u_n)]$ and $[s] \neq [u]$, therefore $(s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_i}, \ldots, s_n) = \phi(u_1, \ldots, \hat{u_i}, \ldots, u_n)$, $s_i = \eta(u_i)$ and $s_i \neq \phi(u_i)$ for $\phi, \eta \in \Delta$. Thus for any $j \neq i$ we have $[(s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_j}, \ldots, s_n)] \neq [(u_1, \ldots, \hat{u_j}, \ldots, u_n)]$. Fix $a = (s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_j}, \ldots, s_n)$. Define a tame map $F = (X_1, \ldots, X_j + f_{a,1}(X_1, \ldots, \hat{X_j}, \ldots, X_n), \ldots, X_n)$ where $f_{a,1}$ is as in lemma 2.2. Thus $F[s] = [(s_1, \ldots, s_{j-1}, s_j + 1, s_{j+1}, \ldots, s_n)]$ and $F[u] = [u]$. We claim that $[(s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_i}, \ldots, s_{j-1}, s_j + 1, s_{j+1}, \ldots, s_n)] \neq [(u_1, \ldots, \hat{u_i}, \ldots, u_n)]$. For suppose that $[(s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_i}, \ldots, s_{j-1}, s_j + 1, s_{j+1}, \ldots, s_n)] = [(u_1, \ldots, \hat{u_i}, \ldots, u_n)]$. Combining it with $(s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_i}, \ldots, s_n) = \phi(u_1, \ldots, \hat{u_i}, \ldots, u_n)$ (in particular $s_k = \phi(u_k)$ for all $k \neq i$) we have $s_j = \phi(u_j)$ and $s_j + 1 = \phi(u_j)$, thus $1 = 0$, a contradiction. Also $[\mathbb{F}_q(s_j + f(s_1, \ldots, \hat{s_j}, \ldots, s_n)) : \mathbb{F}_q] = [\mathbb{F}_q(s_j + 1) : \mathbb{F}_q] = m_j$. □

Lemma 5.14. *Let $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_n) \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $m_i = [\mathbb{F}_q(r_i) : \mathbb{F}_q]$ $\forall$ $1 \leq i \leq n$ with $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_n$, with at least one strict inequality, then there exist $f(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}]$ such that $[\mathbb{F}_q(r_n + f(r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1})) : \mathbb{F}_q] > m_n$.*

Proof. Let $\beta_f = r_n + f(r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1})$. Let

$$N = \#\{\beta_f : f(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}]\}$$

$$= \#\{f(r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1}) : f \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}]\}$$

$$= \#\mathbb{F}_q[r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1}]$$
$$= \#\mathbb{F}_{q^{lcm\{m_1,\ldots,m_{n-1}\}}}.$$

Since $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_n$, has at least one strict inequality therefore if $w = lcm\{m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1}\}$ then $m_n < w$. Thus

$$\#\{a \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} | [\mathbb{F}_q(a) : \mathbb{F}_q] \leq m_n\}$$
$$\leq 1 + q + \cdots + q^{m_n}$$
$$< q^w.$$

Thus there exist some $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}]$ such that $[\mathbb{F}_q(\beta_f) : \mathbb{F}_q] > m_n$.

□

Remark 5.15. If $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_n$, has no strict inequality, then $m_1 = m_2 = \cdots = m_n = m = lcm(m_1, \ldots, m_n)$. Then this is the case done by lemma 5.10.

Lemma 5.16. *Let $s, r, u \in \mathcal{X}$ with $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n), r = (r_1, \ldots, r_n)$ and $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ be in different orbits, suppose that r has ordered type $\overrightarrow{m_r} = (m_1, \ldots, m_n)$. Suppose $F_q(s_i) = F_{q^m}$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, then there exists $T \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $T(s_1, \ldots, s_n) = (s_i, \ldots)$, and the ordered type of r remains unchanged under the map T.*

Proof. If $i = 1$, then $T = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$ identity map. So we can suppose $i \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$. We will give the prove of this lemma in two cases.
Case 1. If $[(r_2, \ldots, r_n)] = [(s_2, \ldots, s_n)]$.
This implies that $s_i \in [r_i]$ which means that $\mathbb{F}_q(r_i) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. Thus $m_i = [\mathbb{F}_q(r_i) : \mathbb{F}_q] = m$ and so the orderd type of r become $m_1 = m_2 \cdots = m_i = m \geq m_{i+1} \geq \cdots \geq m_n$. Taking the map $T = (X_i, X_2, \ldots, X_{i-1}, X_1, X_{i+1}, \ldots, X_n)$ will not change the ordered type of r and $T(s_1, \ldots, s_n) = (s_i, s_2, \ldots, s_{i-1}, s_1, s_{i+1}, \ldots, s_n)$.
Case 2. If $[(r_2, \ldots, r_n)] \neq [(s_2, \ldots, s_n)]$.
Fix $a = (s_2, \ldots, s_n)$. Define $T = (X_1 + f_{a,s_i - s_1}(X_2, \ldots, X_n), X_2, \ldots, X_n)$ where f_{a,s_i-s_1} is as in lemma 2.2 (Notice that since s_i generates $\mathbb{F}_q^m$, we can indeed apply this lemma.) Hence $T(s) = (s_i, s_2, \ldots, s_{i-1}, s_1, s_{i+1}, \ldots, s_n)$ and $T(r) = r$, which proves the lemma.

□

Lemma 5.17. *Let $s, r, u \in \mathcal{X}$ with $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n), r = (r_1, \ldots, r_n)$ and $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ be in different orbits with $\mathbb{F}_q(s_1) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, then there exists $F \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $F([r]) = [s]$ and $F([u]) = [u]$.*

Proof. We will prove this lemma using mathematical induction on the ordered type of r. Our induction step will involve assuming that we have proven the lemma (2-transitivity) for all ordered types $\overrightarrow{\acute{m}_r} = (\acute{m}_1, \acute{m}_2, \ldots, \acute{m}_n)$ of a higher lexicographic order.

We may reorder and rename $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n$ and $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n$ such that $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n$ is of ordered type $\overrightarrow{m_r} = (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_n)$ and s_i is generator of field $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ (i.e. s_1 is moved to the i-th position). Then by lemma 5.16 there exist a tame map $T \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $T(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) = (s_i, \ldots)$ and the ordered type of $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n$ remains unchanged under T. Thus the case $m_1 = m$ is done by proposition 5.10. This is the initial induction case.
We will now formulate the second step of induction involving induction hypothesis. Define the tame map $G := (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n + f(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{n-1}))$, where $f \in \mathbb{F}_q(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{n-1})$ is s.t. $m_n + k = [\mathbb{F}_q(\beta) : \mathbb{F}_q]$ by lemma 5.14 for some $k \geq 1$, where $r_n + f(r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_{n-1}) = \beta$. Fix $a = (u_1, \ldots, u_{n-1})$. Define a tame map $H_f := (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n + h_{a,-f(a)}(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}))$ where $h_{a,-f(a)}$ is as in lemma 2.2. Define $G_1 = H_f \circ G$.
Case 1 Suppose $[(r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1})] \neq [(u_1, \ldots, u_{n-1})]$. We compute $G_1([r]) = G[r] = [(r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_{n-1}, \beta)]$ and $G_1([u]) = H_f \circ G[(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n)] = H_f[(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{n-1}, u_n + f(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{n-1}))] = [(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{n-1}, u_n + f(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{n-1}) - f(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{n-1}))] = [(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n)]$. Rearrange $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_{n-1}, \beta$ by a swap map G_2 to get its ordered type $\overrightarrow{\acute{m}_r} = (\acute{m}_1, \acute{m}_2, \ldots, \acute{m}_n)$, where $\overrightarrow{\acute{m}_r} \geq_{Lex} \overrightarrow{m_r}$. Then by the induction argument there exist a tame map G_3 s.t. $G_3(G_2G_1[r]) = [s]$ and $G_3G_2G_1[u] = [u]$, hence $F = G_3G_2G_1$.
Case 2.
Now suppose that the elements r and u are such that $[(r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1})] = [(u_1, \ldots, u_{n-1})]$. Then by lemma 5.13 we can find a tame map F_1 mapping $[r]$ to $[(\tilde{r_1}, \ldots, \tilde{r}_n)]$ and $[u]$ to $[u]$ such that $[(\tilde{r_1}, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{n-1})] \neq [(u_1, \ldots, u_{n-1})]$ and $[\mathbb{F}_q(\tilde{r_i}) : \mathbb{F}_q] = m_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ (i.e., r and $(\tilde{r_1}, \ldots, \tilde{r}_n)$ has same ordered type). Now by applying the case 1 of this lemma we can find a tame map F_2 such that $F_2F_1[r] = [s]$ and $F_2F_1[u] = [u]$, hence $F = F_2F_1$ is our required map. □

Proposition 5.18. *Let $s, r, u \in \mathcal{X}$ s.t. $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n)$, $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_n)$, and $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ be in different orbits then there exist $F \in TA_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ s.t. $F([r]) = [s]$ and $F([u]) = [u]$.*

Proof. Pick $v = (v_1, 0, 0, \ldots, 0)$ where v_1 is a generator of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. Then by lemma 5.17 there exist $F_1, F_2 \in \mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $F_1([s]) = [v]$, $F_1([u]) = [u]$ and $F_2([r]) = [v]$, $F_2([u]) = [u]$. Define $F = F_1^{-1}F_2$. Then $F([r]) = [s]$ and $F([u]) = [u]$. □

Proof. (of the main theorem 5.1.) Proposition 5.18 shows that $\mathtt{G}$ acts 2-transitively on the set of orbits $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$. This implies the primitivity of the group $\mathtt{G}$ on the set of orbits $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$. Lemma 5.5 shows that $\mathtt{G}$ contains 3-cycles. Hence by Jordan's theorem 5.2, $\mathtt{G}$ contains the alternating group $\mathrm{Alt}(\bar{\mathcal{X}})$. □

6 The case when m is prime integer

Theorem 5.1 shows that $\mathrm{Alt}(\bar{\mathcal{X}}) \subseteq \mathtt{G}$ for $n \geq 3$. In general it is difficult to describe the group $\mathtt{G}$ exactly. But for some particular cases we are able to compute $\mathtt{G}$ and show

which of the two possibilities (alternating or symmetric) it is. In this subsection we assume that m is prime integer. We will prove the following proposition:

Proposition 6.1. *Let m, p be prime integers, $q = p^l : l \geq 1$ and $n \geq 3$, then $\mathtt{G} = Sym(\overline{\mathcal{X}})$ if $q \equiv 3, 7 \mod 8$ with $m = 2$ and $\mathtt{G} = Alt(\overline{\mathcal{X}})$ for all other q and m.*

We will postpone the proof of this proposition to the end of this subsection. We first prove some lemma's that we need.

Lemma 6.2. *Let m, p are prime integers, $q = p^l : l \geq 1$. Let $F_2 := (X_2, X_1, X_3 \ldots, X_n)$ then $\pi_{q^m}(F_2) \in \mathtt{G}$ is odd permutation for $q = 3, 7 \mod 8$ with $m = 2$ and is even permutation for all other m and q.*

Proof. To see the sign of permutation $\pi_{q^m}(F_2)$ we need to count 2-cycles in the decomposition of $\pi_{q^m}(F_2)$ in transpositions. For this, first we will see how many orbits F_2 fixes and then subtract this number from total number of orbits. In this way we will get the total number of orbits moved by F_2. Dividing this number by 2 gives us the number of 2-cycles in $\pi_{q^m}(F_2)$.
To count the number of orbits fixed by F_2, consider $[r] = [F_2(r)]$ for any $r := (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n) \in \mathcal{X}$. Then $r = \phi(F_2(r))$ and in particular $r_1 = \phi(r_2)$, $r_2 = \phi(r_1)$,$r_3 = \phi(r_3)$,...,$r_n = \phi(r_n)$ for all $\phi \in \Delta$. For $\phi = id$, we have $r_1 = r_2$ and $r_3, r_4, \ldots, r_n \in \mathcal{X}$ arbitrary. These are $q^{m(n-1)} - q^{n-1}$ points. For $\phi \neq id$, we have $r_1 = \phi^2(r_1)$, $r_2 = \phi^2(r_2)$, $r_3 = \phi(r_3), \ldots, r_n = \phi(r_n)$ and so $r_1, r_2, r_3, \ldots, r_n \in \mathbb{F}_q$ except for $m = 2$. When $m = 2$ we have $r_1 = \phi(r_2)$ arbitrary and so $r_1 \in \mathbb{F}_{q^2} \setminus \mathbb{F}_q$ and $r_3, r_4, \ldots, r_n \in \mathbb{F}_q$. Thus the case $\phi \neq id$ gives no point for both $m \neq 2$ and $(q^2 - q)q^{n-2}$ points satisfy $[r] = [F_2(r)]$ for $m = 2$.
When counting the number of points which satisfy $[r] = [F_2(r)]$, we get different results for the cases $m \neq 2$ and $m = 2$, so we distinguish these cases.
Case 1 Let $m \neq 2$. In this case the number of points moved by $F_2 = (X_2, X_1, X_3, \ldots, X_n)$ are $\#\mathcal{X} - (q^{m(n-1)} - q^{n-1}) = (q^{mn} - q^n) - (q^{m(n-1)} - q^{n-1})$. Thus the number of orbits moved by F_2 are $\frac{(q^{mn}-q^n)-(q^{m(n-1)}-q^{n-1})}{m}$. So the number of 2-cycles in this permutation are $\frac{(q^{mn}-q^n)-(q^{m(n-1)}-q^{n-1})}{2m}$. Let $Q = (q^{mn} - q^n) - (q^{m(n-1)} - q^{n-1})$. Since $q^m \equiv q \mod m$, thus $Q \equiv 0 \mod m$. Also it is trivial to check $Q \equiv 0 \mod 4$, hence $Q \equiv 0 \mod 4m$. Thus $\pi_{q^m}(F_2)$ is even.
Case 2 Let $m = 2$. So the number of points moved by $F_2 = (X_2, X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ are $\#\mathcal{X} - (q^{2(n-1)} - q^{n-1}) - (q^2 - q)q^{n-2} = (q^{mn} - q^n) - (q^{m(n-1)} - q^{n-1}) - q^n + q^{n-1} = q^{2n} - q^{2(n-1)} - 2q^n + 2q^{n-1}$. Thus the number of orbits moved by F are $\frac{q^{2n}-q^{2(n-1)}-2q^n+2q^{n-1}}{2}$. So the number of 2-cycles in this permutation are $\frac{q^{2n}-q^{2(n-1)}-2q^n+2q^{n-1}}{4}$. Let $Q_1 = q^{2n} - q^{2(n-1)} - 2q^n + 2q^{n-1}$. We have

$$Q_1 \mod 8 = \begin{cases} -4 & \text{if } q \equiv 3, 7 \mod 8 \\ 0 & \text{if } q \equiv 1, 5 \mod 8,\ p = 2 \end{cases}.$$

This shows $\pi_{q^m}(F_2)$ is odd for $q \equiv 3, 7 \mod 8$ and even for $q \equiv 1, 5 \mod 8$, $p = 2$. Thus $\pi_{q^m}(F_2)$ is odd for $q \equiv 3, 7 \mod 8$ with $m = 2$ and is even for all other values of q and m. □

Lemma 6.3. *Let m, p be prime integers, $q = p^l : l \geq 1$ and $\frac{q-1}{2} \notin 2\mathbb{Z}$. Let $F_1 := (aX_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n) : a \in (\mathbb{F}_q)^*$. Then $\pi_{q^m}(F_1) \in \boldsymbol{G}$ is odd permutation for $q = 3, 7 \mod 8$ with $m = 2$ and is even permutation for all other m and q.*

Proof. **Case 1** Let $q = 2^l : l \geq 1$. Then $sign(F_1) = sign({F_1}^{q-1}) = sign(a^{q-1}X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n) = sign(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$. This shows $\pi_{q^m}(F_1)$ is even permutation in this case.
Case 2 Let $\frac{q-1}{2}$ is odd integer. Then $sign(F_1) = sign({F_1}^{\frac{q-1}{2}})$. Thus it is sufficient to consider $\overline{F_1} := {F_1}^{\frac{q-1}{2}} = (-X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$ instead of F_1 to check its sign.
To see the sign of permutation $\pi_{q^m}(F_1)$ we will proceed similar to lemma 6.2. First we will see how many orbits $\overline{F_1}$ fixes and then subtract this number from total number of orbits. In this way we will get the total number of orbits moved by $\overline{F_1}$. Dividing this number by 2 gives us the number of 2-cycles in $\pi_{q^m}(F_2)$.
To count the number of orbits fixed by map $\overline{F_1}$, consider $[r] = [\overline{F_1}(r)]$ for $r := (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n) \in \mathcal{X}$. Then $\overline{F_1}(r) = \phi(r)$ and in particular $-r_1 = \phi(r_1)$, $r_2 = \phi(r_2)$,...,$r_n = \phi(r_n)$ for all $\phi \in \Delta$. For $\phi = id$, we have $r_1 = 0$ and $r_2, r_3, \ldots, r_n \in \mathcal{X}$ arbitrary. This gives $q^{m(n-1)} - q^{n-1}$ points fixed by $\overline{F_1}$. For $\phi \neq id$, we have $-r_1 = (r_1)^{q^i}$ for some integer i and $r_2, r_3, \ldots, r_n \in \mathbb{F}_q$ or equivalently $r_1 = 0$, ${r_1}^{q^i-1} = -1$ and $r_2, r_3, \ldots, r_n \in \mathbb{F}_q$. Now we check how many solutions do the equations $(r_1)^{q^i-1} = -1 : 1 \leq i < m$ have in $(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}) \setminus (\mathbb{F}_q)$. Let α be the generator of $(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^*$ and let $r_1 = \alpha^{\mu_k}$ satisfying $r_1^{q^i-1} = -1$ for some $\mu_k \in \mathbb{Z}$. This gives $\alpha^{\frac{q^m-1}{2}} = -1 = \alpha^{\mu_k(q^i-1)}$. Comparing powers we get $\mu_k = \frac{q^m-1}{2(q^i-1)} + k\frac{q^m-1}{(q^i-1)} : k \in \mathbb{Z}$. We know $i|m$ if and only if $q^i - 1|q^m - 1$. As m is prime therefore $q^i - 1$ does not divides $q^m - 1$ for $1 < i < m$. So $\mu_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Hence we have no solution for $r_1^{q^i-1} = -1$ when $1 < i < m$. For $i = 1$ we can write $\mu_k = \frac{q^{m-1}+q^{m-2}+\cdots+1}{2} + k(q^{m-1} + q^{m-2} + \cdots + 1)$. In this case $\mu_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$ if m is odd prime and $\mu_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ if $m = 2$. The later case $m = 2$ gives us $(q-1)$ solutions $r_1 = \alpha^{\mu_k}$, satisfying $r_1^{q-1} = -1$. Thus for $\phi \neq id$, we have $(q-1)q^{n-1}$ points fixed by $\overline{F_1}$ when $m = 2$ and no point is fixed by $\overline{F_1}$ when m is odd prime.
For m odd prime, the total number of points in $\mathcal{X}$ moved by $\overline{F_1}$ are $(q^{mn} - q^n) - (q^{m(n-1)} - q^{n-1}) := Q$. Thus the number of orbits moved by F are $\frac{Q}{m}$. So the number of 2-cycles in this permutation are $\frac{Q}{2m}$. In this case $Q \equiv 0 \mod m$ and $Q \equiv 0 \mod 4$, thus $Q \equiv 0 \mod 4m$. Hence $\pi_{q^m}(F_1)$ is even permutation in this case.
For $m = 2$, the total number of points in $\mathcal{X}$ moved by $\overline{F_1}$ are $(q^{mn} - q^n) - (q^{m(n-1)} - q^{n-1}) - q^n + q^{n-1} = q^{2n} - q^{2(n-1)} - 2q^n + 2q^{n-1} := Q_1$. Thus the number of orbits moved by F are $\frac{Q_1}{2}$. So the number of 2-cycles in this permutation are $\frac{Q_1}{4}$. In this case

$$Q_1 \mod 8 = \begin{cases} -4 & \text{if } q \equiv 3, 7 \mod 8 \\ 0 & \text{if } q \equiv 1, 5 \mod 8 \end{cases}.$$

Thus F_1 induces odd permutation for $q \equiv 3, 7 \mod 8$ with $m = 2$ and even permutation for all other values of q and m.

□

Lemma 6.4. *Let $F = (X_1 + f(X_2, X_3, \ldots, X_n), X_2, \ldots, X_n)$ then $\pi_{q^m}(F) \in \mathtt{G}$ is even permutation.*

Proof. Define $f_{(\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\ldots,\alpha_n)} \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_2, X_3, \ldots, X_n]$ such that for any $\beta \in (\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^{n-1} \setminus (\mathbb{F}_q)^{n-1}$

$$f_{(\alpha_2,\ldots,\alpha_n)}(\beta) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \beta = (\alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n) \\ 0 & \text{if } \beta \neq (\alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n) \end{cases}.$$

Define $\eta = (X_1 + f_{(\alpha_2,\alpha_3,\ldots,\alpha_n)}, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$. Then $\eta(a, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \ldots, \alpha_n) = (a+1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \ldots, \alpha_n)$: $\eta^p = id$, and $\eta(\beta_1, \beta) = 0$ for any $\beta \neq (\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \ldots, \alpha_n)$, $(\beta_1, \beta) \in \mathcal{X}$. Thus the order of η is p. Hence the permutation induced by η is even. Since the maps of the type η works as generator for shears, $\pi_{q^m}(F) \in \mathtt{G}$ is even. □

Proof. (of the main theorem 6.1) The group $\mathtt{G}$ contains the group $Alt(\overline{\mathcal{X}})$ by the theorem 5.1. Since $\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is generated by the maps of the form F_1, F_2 and F as in lemmas 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 which are even except when $q \equiv 3, 7 \mod 8$ and $m = 2$. Hence we have our desired result.

□

7 A bound on the index of $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ in $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{GA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$

Theorem 5.1 tells us that the action of $\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, if restricted to $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$, contains the action of $\mathrm{Alt}(\bar{\mathcal{X}})$. However, our goal is to understand $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$, and in particular compare it with $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) \cap \mathrm{Perm}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n)$. Define $\mathcal{M}_n^m(\mathbb{F}_q) := \pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) \cap \mathrm{Perm}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n)$. The following theorem estimates how far is the group $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(F_q))$ from $\mathcal{M}_n^m(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

Theorem 7.1. *We have the following bound on index*

$$[\mathcal{M}_n^m(\mathbb{F}_q) : \pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(F_q))] \leq 2^{\sigma_0(m)} \prod_{d|m} d,$$

where $\sigma_0(m)$ is the total number of divisors of m.

We will postpone the proof of this theorem to the end of this section. The remaining part of this section is devoted towards the preparation of the proof of theorem 7.1.

Definition 7.2. If $S \subseteq \bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n$, define $\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q; S)$ as the set of elements in $\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ which are the identity on S. Similarly, if $S = \Delta S$ (i.e. it is a union of orbits) then define $\pi_S : \mathrm{MA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Maps}(S, S)$ and thus also $\pi_S(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)), \pi_S(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q; T)$ etc.

Let L be the union of all orbits of Δ acting on $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_q^n$ of order a strict divisor of m; i.e. L contains all orbits of size d, where $d|m$ but not the ones of size m. Then we have $\pi_L(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ as well as $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q; L))$. The first are permutation on L, the second permutations on $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ which fix L. Is there some way to glue these to get $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$? Well, only in part: $\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ is not a semidirect product of the other two, but their sizes compare::

Lemma 7.3.

$$\#\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) = \#\pi_{\mathcal{X}_1}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) \cdot \#\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q;\mathcal{X}_1)).$$

Proof. Pick a representant system R in $\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ of $\pi_{\mathcal{X}_1}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$. Then for each $\pi_{q^m}(F) \in \pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ there exists a unique $G \in R$ such that $\pi_{q^m}(GF) \in \pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q;\mathcal{X}_1))$. Thus, $\#R \cdot \#\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q;\mathcal{X}_1)) = \#\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$. □

The same proof works too to

$$\#\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q;\mathcal{X}_1)) = \pi_{\mathcal{X}_2}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q;\mathcal{X}_1)) \cdot \pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q;\mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2).$$

Meaning, we can decompose $\#\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q))$ into smaller parts: let $d_0 := 1, d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_{m-1}, d_m := m$ be the increasing list of divisors of m. Let $Q_j = \pi_{\mathcal{X}_{d_j}}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q; \bigcup_{i=0}^{i=d_{j-1}} \mathcal{X}_i))$ for all $0 \leq j \leq m-1$ and $Q_m = \pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q; L))$ where L be the union of orbits of size $d|m, d \neq m$, then

$$\#\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) = \#Q_{d_0} \cdot \#Q_{d_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \#Q_{d_m}.$$

The same construction will work for the group $\mathcal{M}_n^m(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Meaning, we can decompose $\#\mathcal{M}_n^m(\mathbb{F}_q)$ into smaller parts:

$$\#\mathcal{M}_n^m(\mathbb{F}_q) = \#G_{d_0} \cdot \#G_{d_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \#G_{d_m},$$

where G_{d_i} are defined in corollary 4.3.

Define two subgroups of Q_d by $N_d := \{m \in Q_d | m(\mathcal{O}_i) = \mathcal{O}_i\}$ and $R_d := \{m \in Q_d |\, m(\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{r_d}\}) \subseteq \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{r_d}\}\}$ where $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{O}_i$ be the fixed representatives of orbits $\mathcal{O}_i$ of size d. The group N_d moves elements inside the orbits $\mathcal{O}_i$ by keeping orbits $\mathcal{O}_i$ fixed for all i and the group R_d moves only orbits to orbits. By definition $N_d = Ker\{H_d \longrightarrow \pi_{\overline{\mathcal{X}_{d_d}}}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q; \bigcup_{i=0}^{i=d_{d-1}} \overline{\mathcal{X}_i}))\}$ and by theorem 5.1 $\mathrm{Alt}\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{r_d}\} \subseteq R_d \subseteq \mathrm{Perm}\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{r_d}\}$. Hence the group N_d is normal in group Q_d.

Proposition 7.4. *The group Q_d can be represented as a semidirect product of groups N_d and R_d.*

Proof. Since $Q_d = \pi_{\mathcal{X}_{d_d}}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q; \bigcup_{i=0}^{d_{d-1}} \mathcal{X}_i))$, if $\tau \in Q_d$ then $\tau(\alpha_i) = \phi^{\mu_i}(\alpha_{\sigma(i)})$ where $\sigma \in \mathrm{Perm}\,(r_d)$, ϕ is generator for $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m} : \mathbb{F}_q)$ and μ_i is an integer. Then we can find $m_0 \in N_d$ and $m_1 \in R_d$ such that $m_0(\alpha_i) = \phi^{\mu_i}(\alpha_i)$ and $m_1(\alpha_i) = \alpha_{\sigma(i)}$ and $m_1 m_0(\alpha_i) = m_1(\phi^{\mu_i}(\alpha_i)) = \phi^{\mu_i}(m_1(\alpha_i)) = \phi^{\mu_i}(\alpha_{\sigma(i)})$. Thus $R_d N_d = Q_d$. $N_d \cap R_d = \{id\}$ clear by definition of N_d and R_d. Since N_d is normal in Q_d, all conditions for one of the definitions of semidirect product is satisfied. □

Corollary 7.5. *(of the lemma 5.5) Let $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{O}_i$ be the representant of orbits of size d. For any $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist a map $\zeta \in N_d$ such that $\zeta(\alpha_i) = \phi^{-1}(\alpha_i)$ and $\zeta(\alpha_j) = \phi(\alpha_j)$ for all $\phi \in \Delta$ and $\zeta(\alpha_k) = \alpha_k$ for all $k \neq i, j$.*

Proof. Define $A := (-1, 0, \ldots, 0, t), B := (0, -1, 0, \ldots, 0, t), C := (0, 0, \ldots, 0, t)$, where t is a generator of the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{F}_{q^d})^*$. Let $\tilde{s} = s_1 s_2 s_3$ and define $\tilde{w} = \tilde{s}^{-1} s^{-1} d^{-1} \tilde{s} s d$, where

$$s_3 = (X_1, X_2, X_3 + f_3(X_2, X_n), X_4, \ldots, X_n),$$

$$s_2 = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{n-1}, X_n + f_2(X_2, X_3)),$$

$$s_1 = (X_1, X_2, X_3 + f_1(X_2, X_n), X_4, \ldots, X_n),$$

$$f_3(a_2, a_n) = \begin{cases} t & \text{if } (a_2, a_n) = (0, t) \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere if } [(a_2, a_n)] \neq [(0, t)] \end{cases},$$

$$f_2(a_2, a_3) = \begin{cases} \phi(t) - t & \text{if } (a_2, a_3) = (0, t) \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere if } [(a_2, a_3)] \neq [(0, t)] \end{cases},$$

$$f_1(a_2, a_n) = \begin{cases} -t & \text{if } (a_2, a_n) = (0, \phi(t)) \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere if } [(a_2, a_n)] \neq [(0, \phi(t))] \end{cases},$$

and s, d are maps as defined in lemma 5.5.

Note that

$$s_3^{-1} = (X_1, X_2, X_3 - f_3(X_2, X_n), X_4, \ldots, X_n),$$

$$s_2^{-1} = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{n-1}, X_n - f_2(X_2, X_3)),$$

$$s_1^{-1} = (X_1, X_2, X_3 - f_1(X_2, X_n), X_4, \ldots, X_n).$$

Thus $\tilde{w}(A) = \phi(B)$, $\tilde{w}(B) = C$ and $\tilde{w}(C) = \phi^{-1}(A)$. Define $\eta := \tilde{w}^{-1} w$, where w is as defined in lemma 5.5. Thus $\eta(A) = \tilde{w}^{-1} w(A) = \tilde{w}^{-1}(B) = \phi^{-1}(A)$, $\eta(B) = \tilde{w}^{-1} w(B) = \tilde{w}^{-1}(C) = B$ and $\eta(C) = \tilde{w}^{-1} w(C) = \tilde{w}^{-1}(A) = \phi(C)$.
From lemma 5.5, s permutes only the set L_1 and d permutes only the set L_2. Then sd (and hence $s^{-1}d^{-1}$) acts trivially on $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_d \setminus (L_1 \bigcup L_2)$ and nontrivially only on a subset of $L_1 \bigcup L_2$. Thus the map $\tilde{w}$ acts trivially on $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_d \setminus (L_1 \bigcup L_2)$ and nontrivially only on a subset of $L_1 \bigcup L_2$. Since the map w fixes all orbits except $[A]$, $[B]$ and $[C]$, hence the map $\tilde{w}$ can only acts nontrivially on orbits $[A]$, $[B]$ and $[C]$ due to definition of $\tilde{s}$.
Since the group Q_d contains the alternating permutation group on $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{r_d}\}$ by theorem 5.1, it is 2-transitive. Thus there exist a map $\xi \in Q_d$ such that $\xi(A) = \alpha_i$ and $\xi(C) = \alpha_j$. Hence $\zeta = \xi \eta \xi^{-1}$ is our required map. □

Corollary 7.6. *The group N_d contains a group isomorphic to $\{(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{r_d}) \in (\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z})^{r_d}; a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_{r_d} = 0\}$.*

Proof. Since for any $\sigma \in N_d$, $\sigma(\alpha_i) = \phi^{a_i}(\alpha_i)$ and $a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_{r_d} = 0$ by corollary 7.5, where α_i are representative for orbits $\mathcal{O}_i$ of order d and ϕ is generator for $Gal(\mathbb{F}_{q^m} : \mathbb{F}_q)$. Since $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^d} : \mathbb{F}_q) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})$, hence $\{(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{r_d}) \in (\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z})^{r_d}; a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_{r_d} = 0\} \subseteq N_d$. □

Lemma 7.7. *We have the following bound on the index*

$$[G_d : Q_d] \leq 2d.$$

Proof. Since

$$G_d \cong (\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^{r_d} \rtimes (\mathrm{Perm}(r_d)),$$
$$Q_d \cong N_d \rtimes R_d.$$

Also by lemma 7.5

$$\{(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{r_d}) \in (\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z})^{r_d}; a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_{r_d} = 0\} \subseteq N_d$$

and by theorem 5.1

$$\mathrm{Alt}\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{r_d}\} \subseteq R_d \subseteq \mathrm{Perm}\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{r_d}\}.$$

Since $[(\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^{r_d} : N_d] \leq d$, $[\mathrm{Perm}(r_d) : R_d] \leq 2$, hence $[G_d : Q_d] \leq 2d$. □

Proof. (of main theorem 7.1) Since

$$\#\pi_{q^m}(\mathrm{TA}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)) = \#Q_{d_0} \cdot \#Q_{d_1} \cdots \#Q_{d_m},$$
$$\#\mathcal{M}_n^m(\mathbb{F}_q) = \#G_{d_0} \cdot \#G_{d_1} \cdots \#G_{d_m}.$$

By lemma 7.7 we have the result. □

Corollary 7.8. *(of the theorems 6.1, 7.1)*
For $m = 2, q \cong 3, 7 \mod 8$ *we have*

$$[\mathcal{M}_n^2(\mathbb{F}_q) : \pi_{q^2}(\mathrm{TA}_n(F_q))] \leq 2.$$

Proof. Combine theorems 6.1 and 7.1. □

References

[1] Edo, Eric; Poloni, Pierre-Marie. *On the closure of the tame automorphism group of affine three-space.* preprint (2014) arXiv:1403.2843

[2] van den Essen, Arno. *Polynomial automorphisms and the Jacobian conjecture.* Progress in Mathematics, 190. Birkh' auser Verlag, Basel, 2000.

[3] Kaloujnine, Léo. *La structure des p-groupes de Sylow des groupes symtriques finis.* Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3) 65, (1948). 239-276.

[4] Maubach, Stefan. *Polynomial automorphisms over finite fields.* Serdica Math. J. 27 (2001), no. 4, 343-350.

[5] Maubach, Stefan; Willems, Roel. *Polynomial automorphisms over finite fields: mimicking tame maps by the Derksen group.* Serdica Math. J. 37 (2011), no. 4, 305-322 (2012).

[6] Maubach, Stefan. *Triangular polynomial maps in characteristic p.* preprint (2013) , arXiv:1106.5800

[7] Smith, Martha K. *Stably tame automorphisms.* J. Pure Appl. Algebra 58 (1989), no. 2, 209-212.

[8] I. Shestakov and U. Umirbaev, *The tame and the wild automorphisms of polynomial rings in three variables*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 17 (2004), no. 1, 197-227

[9] I. Shestakov and U. Umirbaev, *Poisson brackets and two-generated subalgebras of rings of polynomials*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 17 (2004), no. 1, 181-196